DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 099 926 CS 500 921

AUTHOR Byers, Robert J.
TITLE Let the Kiddeos Play with the Videos and Don't Punt When You're About to Make a Touchdown.
INSTITUTION Montana Speech Communication Association.
PUB DATE 73
NOTE 12p.
JOURNAL CIT The Communicator; v4 n2 p13-22 Spring 1973

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.75 HC-$1.50 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS Audiences; *Audiovisual Instruction; *Communication (Thought Transfer); Elementary Education; *Speech Education; Teacher Evaluation; *Video Equipment; *Video Tape Recordings

ABSTRACT

In developing a case for the acquisition and use of the video tape recorder (VTR), this paper examines four questions: (1) Can VTR be used as a teaching machine? (2) Is there justification for using VTR in the whole school? (3) Can VTR be used with remedial groups? and (4) Are there proven methods of effective use of VTR in speech classrooms? The research done in these areas indicates that at least a partially affirmative answer can be given to all these questions. Results show that the video tape playback of students' communicative acts, which focuses on the audience and is accompanied by instructor and student discussion and criticism, can make a positive contribution toward increasing students' insights into the communicative process and focusing their attention on their audience and the content of their messages. (TS)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

ED 099926

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS COPYRIGHTED MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Montana Speech Communication Assn.
TO ERIC AND ORGANIZATIONS OPERATING UNDER AGREEMENTS WITH THE NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION. FURTHER REPRODUCTION OUTSIDE THE ERIC SYSTEM REQUIRES PERMISSION OF THE COPYRIGHT OWNER.

THE COMMUNICATOR

of the

Montana Speech Communication Association

Volume IV Spring 1973 Number 2

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Editorial. 2

Report of the Spring MSCA Conference 3

A Personal Review. 4
William W. Wilmot

Obscenity: Its Use and Abuse. 6
Sharon M. McGuire

Let the Kiddeos Play with the Videos and Don't Punt When You're About to Make a Touchdown. 13
Robert J. Byers

Oral Interpretation in the Public Schools: An Approach for the Teacher 23
David M. Fisher

* *

Editors: Dave Fisher and Jim Polsin

Typist: Michelle Peterson

CS 500 921

8. Michener, James A., "Kent State: What Happened and Why," Reader's Digest, April, 1971.

9. Montagu, Ashley, The Anatomy of Swearing, New York, 1971.

10. Osborne, Michael M., "The Evolution of the Story of Metaphor in Rhetoric," Western Speech, Vol. 31, 1967.

11. Postman, Neil and Weingartner, Charles, The Soft Revolution, Delacorte Press, New York, 1971.

12. Rothwell, Dan J., "Verbal Obscenity: Time for Second Thoughts," Western Speech, Vol. 35, 1971.

13. Rubin, Jerry, Do It!, Dell Publishing, 1970.

14. Windt, Theodore Otto, "The Diatribe: Last Resort for Protest," Journal of Speech, February, 1972.

15. Webster's Dictionary.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

****

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS COPYRIGHTED MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Robert J. Byers

TO ERIC AND ORGANIZATIONS OPERATING UNDER AGREEMENTS WITH THE NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION. FURTHER REPRODUCTION OUTSIDE THE ERIC SYSTEM REQUIRES PERMISSION OF THE COPYRIGHT OWNER.

LET THE KIDDEOS PLAY WITH THE VIDEOS AND DON'T PUNT WHEN YOU'RE ABOUT TO MAKE A TOUCHDOWN

by

Robert J. Byers*

I had hoped that the article written by Jerry L. Rubier in the last issue of The Communicator would provide the necessary background needed to develop a case for video tape recording in the classroom. I found, instead, that he had only confused the issues that many of us were trying to clear up about the pros and cons of using video equipment. I think that he was able to deal with the topic as far as he chose to go. What we need, though, is not an ambiguous article outlining the deficiencies of communication research, but an article that clearly outlines the information that we have in trying to find an answer to the question of whether or not we should be using video equipment in our classrooms.

I think that the only way we will be able to justify the expenditure of school money on video recorder equipment is to

*Mr. Byers is a Senior at the University of Montana, Missoula, majoring in Speech Communication.

demonstrate that the equipment may be used in more than one setting. I think that we, as professionals, should not try to be greedy by trying to deny the use of video equipment to the athletic department, but rather use their interest to procure the equipment for the school as a whole.

In developing this case for video tape equipment, I shall try to answer four questions that my research generated. First, can video tape recorders be used as a teaching machine? Secondly, is there a justification for using a video tape recorder in the whole school? Thirdly, can video tape recorders be used with our remedial groups? Finally, are there proven methods of effective use of video tape recorders in speech classrooms?

To respond to the first question: I think that we must try to find an answer in two areas: Motor skills and non-motor skills. The first area that I tried to examine was using the VTR in trying to teach basic motor skills. You may read for many hours on this subject and find thousands of abstracts on the success and failure of the equipment and the methods of use in teaching basic motor skills. One could accurately generalize to the extent to say that the research tends to conclude in four areas:

1. VTR messages work better than film messages for the instruction of motor skill activities.
2. VTR messages can be very effective, moderately effective, or not effective at all in relation to the instruction of motor skill activities.
3. VTR messages can be very effective in helping an individual polish his or her basic form.
4. VTR messages can promote a better understanding of the skill even though the performance of that skill does not improve.

When we look at these results, most would agree that we might have a justification for limited use of VTR equipment in the gym, but not in the classroom. This might very well be the reasoning behind Mr. Rubier's question when he asks, "Was your video tape recorder purchased for the athletic department?"[1] We should look beyond the obvious and realize that we as speech teachers do teach motor skills in our classrooms. Eye contact, body movement, gestures and general posture are but a few of the motor skills that we must be able to teach if we are to produce effective speakers.

I also believe that we must be able to justify the use of VTR equipment in other areas. I think that we should take a look at the value of the VTR unit in relation to its effectiveness in teaching non-motor skills. Working from the assumption ". . .visual materials leave stronger impressions than verbal materials. . ."[2], we might be able to generalize a case for VTR equipment in this area. Unfortunately, some of the research in this area does not lend much support for our position. A study by B. E. Bradly hypothesized "the use of the video

tape recorder in a beginning speech course does not have a significant effect on the students' ability to recall the theoretical principles taught in the course."[3] He found through his research he could accept his hypothesis and he did so with this conclusion: ". . .it made no difference whether the video recorder was used never, once, or constantly."[4]

With this realization, I think it is clear that we must be willing to place some limitations on our use of this equipment. Our administrators must also be willing to accept that some of the results that we would like to see occurring from the use of VTR equipment might be some time in coming. With these limitations in mind, let me turn to the next question. I don't think that we will have to look too hard in trying to find a justification for the use of video tape recorders in the whole school.

One area of use, which seems to be overlooked in this part of the country, is turning the camera around and using it for teacher evaluation and teacher training. If we believe that our students will be able to grow from having their activities monitored, then I think we should be willing to try it ourselves. Many universities across the country have tried this type of training, and found it can be of great importance. I think now is the time for many of the teachers who are already in the systems around our state to look into the possibilities of using this equipment to improve any of the shortcomings they might have. This opportunity could help many of the administrators who will be looking down a long tunnel of teacher evaluation if accountability continues to grow in popularity. Leading authorities have commented on the successful use of this equipment for this purpose. "The VTR makes it possible for teachers to assess their strengths and weaknesses in an objective fashion for themselves. They do not have to rely on second-hand data--they can see themselves exactly as they are seen by their supervisors, principles and students."[5]

It has been found that some teachers will act as our students do, or as the students did in the Bradly study. Some will simply overlook these areas in which they are weak or those areas which they are strong in will receive all of their attention. Hidden within this limitation lies the key to effective use of VTR equipment in the speech classroom. The student must be made aware of what the teacher is looking for. As Birch pointed out in 1970, most people will not focus on those problem areas they might have, and will need direction from the figure in charge of the activity.

I think there is a very good case for the use of VTR equipment in any class in our high school which could make use of student dramas as a learning device. Knudson (1970) points this opportunity out with forty ninth-grade students and their use of VTR equipment. He had the students in small groups producing small dramas to illustrate the subject that was to

be learned. The students were the total creators of these dramas. They wrote all of the parts, they did the casting, the shooting and the small amount of editing before class presentation. The results this man and his students were able to obtain I think are most striking:

1. The Otis Test of Mental Ability scores were up significantly for the experimental group.
2. The Metropolitan Advanced Reading Test scores were up significantly for the experimental group.
3. The experimental group made significant growth in language ability.
4. There was also a remarkable attitude change in the experimental group which took on these forms:
   a. better attendance, and
   b. less individual failure.

Two individuals, Goldhaber and Kline, try to make a case for VTR equipment in the fourth area alone. "If video tape can provide an extra stimulus to promote better attendance and attitudes, then it just may be worth the extra cost and effort. . . ."[6]

When we are trying to evaluate a teaching method for our average group of students, I have found it is also wise to evaluate it in the light of our remedial groups. I think Mr. Rubier would like to see this done when he sets up the behavioral objective, "To improve the acquisition and learning process of language, ten remedial reading students in grades nine and ten will use the 'talk-write' techniques, reinforced by immediate feedback by a video tape recorder for a period of six weeks and will show an increase in basic language skills as determined by a national pre-test, post-test analysis. Students will work individually for six weeks under independent studies and 100 percent of the students must complete nine of the ten hours of programmed learning in order to satisfy the independent study contract."[7] From the reading that I have done, I find that the information doesn't support this objective. I don't think that the VTR machine is really designed for use in this type of instruction, as I don't think that the remedial student is really ready to evaluate himself. Wadsworth supports this conclusion when he asserts that he can find no real value for language development of mentally retarded children.

I have thus far tried to look at the VTR equipment as it might affect the whole school. I would now like to focus the remainder of the paper in the direction of the basic speech class and see if there is any hope for us. To be honest with what I have found in this area, I have decided to report both sides of the research, even though to report only the positive side might have made a stronger case. A variety of meaningless statistics can be found dealing with this problem, but it is Bradly who really drops the bomb.

In addition to the hypothesis that I have already mentioned, Bradly hypothesized two more ideas:

1. "The use of the video recorder in a beginning speech course does not have a significant effect on the student's speaking ability."[8]

2. "The use of the video recorder in a beginning speech course does not have a significant effect on the attitudes of the student toward the course."[9]

Bradly employed a method of recording each speaker and letting that person come in and view his performance at a later date. I do not support this type of utilization of VTR equipment, and Bradly's results will help to indicate why. In relation to the first hypothesis, Bradly found "if these results are valid, then speaking ability is not affected during a basic speech course by using the video recorder to view speaking assignments in the classroom."[10] My immediate reaction to this conclusion was to think that a lot of people in the United States were wasting a lot of money on hundreds of high school speech students.

In dealing with the second hypothesis, Bradly concludes, ". . .constant use caused the students in this study to have a significantly more favorable attitude toward the Intellectual Atmosphere and Content Evaluation of the course."[11] In looking further at his last remarks, ". . .it would appear that the only value of using a video recorder in a basic speech class is to improve the student's attitude toward certain aspects of the course."[12] It seems that all we are really able to do is turn the student on, even if the student doesn't know what he is being turned on to.

In summarizing the Bradly study, I had hoped that the problem would be limited to the method that he used. I believed that the most effective use of the video tape recorder could be made with the whole class and the instructor making comments on the speech with the subject in the room to observe the whole activity. Alas, McCrosky and Lashbrook come to my rescue and demonstrate my point. They began, "From a reading of the literature relating to the use of television (VTR) in classes in public speaking, it is clear that the way it is most frequently employed is consistent with the way we found it to have a negative impact. Our results indicate that showing the student speaker his speech on video tape works, with no other input, directly counter to the goals of our course and those of many other speech educators."[13] These two gentlemen felt that giving and seeing the speech was an incomplete process for the student and that he should play a more active part in the criticism than to just sit and watch. They also point out that the timing of the replay is particularly important and the teacher should try to replay the speech as soon as possible. They continued by noting, "Video tape playback of students'

communicative acts which focuses on the audience and is accompanied by instructor and student discussion and criticism can make a positive contribution toward increasing students' insight into the communicative process and focusing their attention on their audience and the content of their messages."[14] I think this points out that our cameras should be mobile and that we shouldn't be afraid of showing how the audience is reacting to various portions of the speech. These gentlemen felt that students who received video playback with criticism and discussion would do better than those who got only playback or only discussion. Their empirical analysis of this question demonstrates they were correct and begins to give us a real basis for a justification of VTR equipment.

After finding this research on the question, it seemed there was no end to the amount of material which is available praising the use of video tape recorders in speech activities. As long as we bear in mind that the method in this case is more important than the tool, I think we will be able to produce students and results which will justify the total investment. Several authorities have also made comments about the instructor and the role he should play in this teaching method. "When accompanied by an appropriate, positive critique by a qualified instructor, VTR feedback can improve oral interpretation performance, and therefore warrants consideration as a useful tool in teaching oral interpretation."[15] With this, we must remember that the VTR can only report to the student what he did. It is still up to the teacher to help the student correct problems after they have been identified. I believe the teacher who tries this tool in order to escape work will really only compound his work.

So finally, realize "televised feedback provides a reader with his unique reading (speaking) characteristics. It is only when the student sees his communication as others see it that he really perceives his problems."[16] To Mr. Rubier and administrators I say, let's let the KIDDEO'S play the VIDEO'S and don't PUNT when you are about to make a touchdown.

Footnotes

1. Jerry L. Rubier, "Kiddeo-Video-or-Punt," The Communicator, Vol. 4, Winter 1973, p. 28.

2. William Seiler, "Audio-Visual Materials in Classroom Instruction: A Theoretical Approach," Speech Teacher, September 1972, Vol. 21, p. 204.

3. B. E. Bradly, "Experimental Study of the Effectiveness of the Video-recorder in Teaching a Basic Speech Course," Speech Teacher, Vol. 19, September 1970, p. 161.

4. Ibid., Bradly, p. 161.

5. J. L. Klingstedt, "Technology Aids Self-Evaluation," Educational Technology, Vol. 12, October 1972, p. 73.

6. Gerald M. Goldhaber and John A. Kline, "Effects of Video Tape on Attendance and Attitude in Fundamentals of Speech Communications Course," Speech Teacher, Vol. 17, March 1968, p. 98.

7. Op. cit., Rubier, p. 29.

8. Op. cit., Bradly, p. 162.

9. Ibid., p. 162.

10. Ibid., p. 166.

11. Ibid., p. 166.

12. Ibid., p. 167.

13. J. C. McCrosky and W. B. Lashbrook, "Effect of Various Methods of Employing Video-Taped Television Playback in a Course in Public Speaking," Speech Teacher, Vol. 19, September 1970, p. 205.

14. Ibid., p. 205.

15. Thomas D. Porter, William G. King, "The Use of Video Tape Equipment in Improving Oral Interpretation Performance," Speech Teacher, Vol. 21, March 1972, p. 105.

16. Ibid., p. 105.

Bibliography

From Dissertation Abstracts International; volume, date, and page numbers noted.

Birch, Daniel Richard, "Effects of Inquiry Orientation and Guided Self-Analysis Using Videotape on the Verbal Teaching Behavior of Intermediate Grade Student Teachers," Vol. 31A, Nos. 3-4, pg. 1109-A, 1971.

Campbell, Robert Lee, "The Effects of Videotape Instruction on Cognitive and Affective Learning of College of Agriculture Students," Vol. 31A, Nos. 5, 1971, p. 3271-A.

Del Rey, Patricia, "The Effects of Videotaped Feedback and Environmental Certainty on Form, Accuracy, and Latency During Skill Acquisition," Vol. 31A, no. 7, 1971, p. 3317-A.

 BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Fitzgerald, Jr., "The Effect of Videotaped Modeling Procedures on the Verbal Behaviors of Student Teachers,"Vol. 31A, No. 8, 1971, p. 4002-A.

Frankel, Mark, "Videotape Modeling and Self-Confrontation Techniques: An Evaluation of Their Effects on Micro-Counseling Behavior," Vol. 32-B, No. 3, 1971, p. 1840-B.

Gross, Gerald Kern, "A Study of the Effect of Use of the Video Tape Recorder in the Teaching of Beginning Conducting," Vol. 31A, No. 5, 1970, p. 2229-A.

Hedges, Lowell Eugene, "The Feasibility of Using Videotape Techniques in Pre-Service Teacher Education in Agriculture," Vol. 31A, Nos. 3-4, 1970, p. 1664-A.

Hoops, M. Dean, "A Study of the Effects of Videotape Feedback Upon the Verbal Behavior of Teachers in Classes for the Mentally Handicapped," Vol. 31A, Nos. 1-2, 1970, p. 663-A.

James, Helen Hope Ellis, "Effects of Three Supervisory Methods Upon the Development of a Teaching Strategy Among Science Student Teachers," Vol. 31A, No. 6, 1971, p. 2774-A.

Jones, Gary, Hayden, "Student Produced Video Taped and Live Instructional Lessons as They Relate to Satisfaction, Improvisation and Reciprocity," Vol. 31A, Nos. 1-2, 1970, p. 295-A.

Karasar, Niyazi, "Impact of Video Feedback on Teacher's Eye Contact Mannerisms in Microteaching," Vol. 31A, No. 7, 1971, p. 3391-A.

Kautz, William David, "Effectiveness of Videotape Feedback and Systematic Observation Training in Modifying the Verbal Behavior of Student Teachers," Vol. 31A, No. 6, 1970, p. 2774-A.

Knudson, Richard Lewis, "The Effect of Pupil-Prepared Videotaped Dramas on Language Development of Selected Rural Children," Vol. 31A, No. 5, 1970, p. 2257-A.

LaFollette, James Joseph, "The Effect of Video-Feedback and Demonstration Film Loops on Learning Basic Archery Skill," Vol. 31A, No. 1-2, 1970, p. 296-A.

Loper, Marvin Dennis, "Videotaped Feedback and Changes in Self-Concept During and After Sensitivity Training," Vol. 31A, No. 8, 1971, p. 3712-A.

McCord, Bob Carroll, "A Comparison of Four Methods of Speech Instruction with Third and Fourth Grade Culturally

Deprived Boys and Girls as Measured by Improvement in Articulation, Auditory Memory Span, and Vocabulary," Vol. 31A, No. 6, 1970, p. 3075-A.

Prince, Paul Taylor, "Video-Tape Recording in Discovery-Reinforcement with Navaho Students," Vol. 31A, No. 8, 1971, p. 4314-A.

Smith, Barbara Bramlette, "The Effectiveness of Television Video Tape Instant Playback in Learning the Pitch and Run Shot in Golf," Vol. 31A, No. 3-4, 1970, p. 1059-A.

Stech, Ernest Lenert, "An Empirical Study of Videotape Self-Confrontation, Self-Evaluation, and Behavior Change in Speech Therapist Trainees," Vol. 31A, No. 2, 1970, p. 502-A.

Turner, Ronald Joe, "Description of the Development and Validation of a Programmed Print and Video-Taped Instructional Message," Vol. 31A, No. 8, 1971, p. 4316-A.

Tuttle, Roland Luther, "The Effects of Videotape Self-Analysis on Teacher Self-Concepts, Effectiveness, and Perceptions of Students," Vol. 33A, No. 7, 1973, p. 1577-A.

Wadsworth, Homer George, "The Effect of a Videotape Playback Process on Language Skills, Intelligence, Self-Concept, and Classroom Behavior of Educable Mentally Handicapped Children," Vol. 33A, No. 8, 1973, p. 3447-A.

Ward, Jerry Parker, "Videotape Feedback as It Influences Elementary School Children in Their Ability to Perform a Motor Task," Vol. 31A, No. 8, 1971, p. 3945-A.

Whitney, Alton Daniel, "Counselor-Teacher Consultations Including Video Analysis to Reduce Undesirable Student Responses," Vol. 31A, No. 10, 1971, p. 5142-A.

Wiengand, Regis Barry, "The Effectiveness of a Videotape Model in Developing Supportive Teaching Behaviors," Vol. 31A, No. 1, 1970, p. 272-A.

Wood, Nelson Frederick, "A Study of the Effect of Video Tape Instant Replay on Learning Gymnastic Skills," Vol. 31A, No. 1, 1970, p. 206-A.

Wrenn, Jerry Parker, "Videotape Feedback as It Influences Elementary School Children in Their Ability to Perform a Motor Task," Vol. 31A, No. 8, 1971, p. 3945-A.

Yenawine, Gardner Drew, "A Comparison of the Effects of Audiotape and Videotape Playback of Counselor-Trainee Counseling Sessions on Individual and Group Experience in the Counseling Practicum," Vol. 31A, No. 1, 1970, p. 169-A.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Other Readings

Brooks, W. D., "Innovative Instructional Strategies for Speech Communication," Today's Speech, 20: 39-47, Fall 1972.

Davis, A. R., "Videotapes in Public Schools," Educational Digest, 37: 52-53, September 1971.

Goldhaber, Gerald M. and John A. Kline, "Effects of Video Tape on Attendance and Attitude in Fundamentals of Speech Communications Course," Speech Teacher, Vol. 17, March 1968.

Klingstedt, J. L., "Technology Aids Self-Evaluation," Educational Technology, 12: 73, October 1972.

Nelson, T. F., "We're Failing to Teach Effective Talking," Today's Education, 60: 43, October 1971.

Porter, Thomas D. and William G. King, "The Use of Video Tape Equipment in Improving Oral Interpretation Performance," Speech Teacher, Vol. 21, March 1972.

Seiler, William J., "The Effects of Visual Materials on Attitudes, Credibility, and Retention," Speech Monographs, Vol. 38, 1971.

Seiler, William J., "Audiovisual Materials in Classroom Instruction: A Theoretical Approach," Speech Teacher, Vol. 21, September 1972.

Rubier, Jerry L., "Kiddeo-Video-or-Punt: A Partial Review of the Literature Concerning Video Tape Recorder and Cognitive Learning Processes," The Communicator, Vol. 4, No. 1, Winter 1973.

****